UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

Editors

John Haynes Holmes Francis Neilson

The Way of Life

By HENRY R. MUSSEY

The United States in Foreign Affairs

By CHARLES F. DOLE

Does a Universal Religion Necessitate Religious Uniformity?

By SAMUEL SCHULMAN

VOLUME XCI NUMBER 1

Chicago, March 1, 1923

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

(Established 1878)

Subscription, $3.00 per Annum

A Journal of the Religion of Democracy

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES : *Editors* : FRANCIS NEILSON

UNITY Fellowship

FRANK C. DOAN
CHARLES F. DOLE
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
HENRY R. MUSSEY
FRANCIS NEILSON
EDMUND H. REEMAN
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ANNA GARLIN SPENCER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Managing Editor

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JENKIN LL. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCIS L. ROBBINS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich, - } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Charles W. Casson
George Willis Cooke
Percy M. Dawson
James Waldo Fawcett
Zona Gale
David Starr Jordan
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—P. M. Matthéeff
CANADA—Sidney Snow
ENGLAND—Fred Hankinson
E. D. Morel
Walter Walsh
FRANCE—G. Demartial
Romain Rolland
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

UNITY Fellowship Associates

BOND OF UNION

We, the undersigned, believing in the association of all men and women who are in sympathy with the aims and ideals set forth in the Announcement printed November 3rd, 1921, do invite all who wish to co-operate to join in a world-wide fellowship that has no bounds of race or creed.

The name of this fellowship is The Unity Fellowship Associates and its purpose is the interpretation of the Religion of Democracy. Membership means a declaration of sympathy and interest. There are no dues. Members may make voluntary contributions which will be used for the purpose of making known the aims of the Fellowship and the publication of its literature.

UNITY will be the organ of this Fellowship and all members will be requested, though not compelled, to be subscribers.

Lists of the members will be sent to all members so that they may be known to one another. Local groups may be formed wherever there exists a sufficient number and there is the desire to do so.

All persons who desire to become members may do so by sending their names to UNITY, care of Abraham Lincoln Centre, Chicago, Ill.

Name .....

Address .....

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

To UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY,
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago.

Gentlemen:

Enclosed you will find check for which please enter my subscription to UNITY for one year.

Mr. (Mrs. or Miss) _____

Address _____

Rates: $3.00 ($3.50 in Canada; $4:00 in other countries) for a year's subscription. Single copies 10 cents.

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Notes 3
The Way of Life.—HENRY R. MUSSEY..... 5
Editorial Correspondence:
The United States in Foreign Affairs.—REV. CHARLES F. DOLE..... 7
Berlin Notes.—REV. SYDNEY STRONG..... 8

ARTICLES—

Does a Universal Religion Necessitate Religious Uniformity?—RABBI SAMUEL SCHULMAN, D.D. 10

THE STUDY TABLE—

"A Receivership for Civilization."—REV. GEORGE GILMOUR 14

POETRY—

My Native Land.—*Fanny Bixby Spencer*..... 3
A Sketch in Black and White.—JAMES HARCOURT WEST 6
The Wind.—*John S. Vaughan*..... 15

THE FIELD—

General Defense Committee.—A. V. AZUARA, SAM SCARLETT, C. L. LAMBERT, ARCHIE SINCLAIR 15

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOL. XCI THURSDAY, MARCH 1, 1923 NUMBER 1

MY NATIVE LAND

A Song, To Be Sung to the Music of "America the Beautiful."

My native land is all the world,
I know no lesser scope
Than vibrant earth and ocean spanned
By brotherhood and hope.
Upon a common soil sustained,
'Neath one all-nurturing sun,
Humanity in every aim
Must win or lose as one.

Where'er the mind of man hath scaled,
I count my country's gain,
And where my brothers' blood is spilled,
I touch her carnal stain.
Writ clear upon the scroll of time,
Her cosmic growth I scan,
As God-lit thought reveals the law
Of love of man to man.

Costa Mesa, Calif. —*Fanny Bixby Spencer.*

In the summer of 1918, UNITY ran into the Espionage Act, with the result that the issues dated July 4, 11, 18, 25, and August 1, all edited and prepared by Jenkin Lloyd Jones, were ordered by the Post Office Department "withheld from the mails . . . as non-mailable under the Espionage Act." This order (dated August 24, 1918) followed trouble which began with the issue of UNITY for April 11, and continued with the issues for June 13 and 20, all of which were mailed, however, before investigation was called for. Later issues—August 8, 15 and 22—were similarly "declared non-mailable." The issue for August 29, after being held up for a time, was finally released; and a copy, sent first class and special delivery, was received by Mr. Jones on his death-bed, and examined in his last conscious moments. After a lapse of nearly five years, during which the Espionage Act itself has been wiped off the statute books, these suppressed copies of UNITY have at last been released by the government, and mailed to the persons to whom they were originally addressed, namely, those whose names were upon our subscription lists in 1918. We ask that these copies be examined with the utmost care. Each and every one of them is a document of first-class historical importance. Together they constitute a significant exhibit as to what is seditious in war-time. The present editors would regard themselves as faithless to the memory of Jenkin Lloyd Jones, did they not here record it as their solemn conviction that the suppression of these issues is the proudest episode in the history of UNITY and in the career of its former editor. When other religious papers were lending aid and comfort to the foulest war in history, this paper was faithful enough to the ideals of truth and brotherhood to win the rebuke and punishment of the government. This is our "legion of honor" decoration!

What are our means of defense? Neither fire-arms nor the sword, but merely a firm determination to deny any aid to the enemy, simply passive resistance, over which no power in the world can triumph.

Thus speaks Chancellor Cuno to the German people in the hour of the invasion of their territory by France. This doesn't sound much like what Kaiser Wilhelm II used to say in his day. It doesn't sound much like what any ruler of any European country has ever said when arms were at hand for battle. It sounds more like Tolstoy, or Gandhi, or Jesus the Nazarene. Personally we do not think that Cuno and the Germans generally are any more non-resistant pacifists than they ever were; and for this reason are we sceptical of their ability to carry through the campaign of "non-co-operation" upon which they have so bravely and effectively entered. An achievement of this kind requires conviction and discipline, of which the Germans, like all other occidentals, have neither. But Cuno's statement is true all the same; and the German people, as far as they have gone, have demonstrated its truth. Nothing so pitiful as the French invasion of the Ruhr has been seen for centuries, if indeed ever before in history. Three things, and three things only, has France accomplished. First, she has reduced the steady stream of reparation payments from Germany to the merest trickle; secondly, she has piled up for herself a veritable mountain of expense in maintaining an army of occupation in hostile territory; thirdly, she has kindled a conflagration of hate which will sooner or later spread to her own borders and consume her. Let Germany stick fast to her present policy, and, at the worst, she will fall only as all of Europe falls, while, at the best, she will save herself from destruction as no arms could ever save her. Both for the defeat of your enemy and your own salvation, non-resistance is supreme.

One of the bits of humor connected with the present appeal of the Filipinos for the granting of freedom to them is to be found in a speech made a year ago

by former Governor-General Forbes before the Boston City Club. General Forbes's chief complaint in that speech against the Filipino government was that the roads that had been built under his administration, and which were evidently the pride of his heart, had not been kept up as he thought they should have been during the time that has passed since his administration. In view of the condition of the roads in many parts of our own country during a large part of the year when they are all but impassable it hardly seems possible that we can set up a "road standard" as a basis of a "stable government." Governor Forbes did not, however, call attention to the fact that there had been no lynchings in the Islands since his departure. Perhaps the people of the Philippines think that the absence of lynchings may in some degree offset their neglect of Governor Forbes's roads! Governor-General Wood, by the way, in a recent message to the Filipino legislature made a recommendation which we sincerely hope will be acted upon. He said, "There is one final recommendation to which I earnestly invite your favorable consideration, and that is the extension of the suffrage to the women of the Islands under the same condition and to the same extent that you have extended it to the men. Such action will tend to build up and greatly extend an enlightened public opinion, to raise the standard of public and private morality, to increase the interest in public affairs and to greatly improve the efficiency of government; in a word, it will tend to the advancement and the betterment of the people of the Philippine Islands." It seems strange that General Wood can state so directly and clearly the fundamental argument for suffrage, which is that opportunity and responsibility are the basic factors in development of individuals and a people, and at the same time not be willing to grant independence to his wards. Every word of his argument for woman suffrage is also an argument for independence.

We have known for a long time that Jane Addams was being mentioned for the Nobel Peace Prize in 1923; but we did not know, until we saw it in the February 21st issue of *The Nation,* that this fact was public property. Now that the announcement has been made, we hasten to declare our belief that Miss Addams is entitled to this honor (if it be such!) as few persons in all the world are so entitled. We can count on the fingers of one hand those who could be mentioned with her in this regard. It seems to us that she has every qualification. She bore witness to peace, when most men and women were either silent, or else baying madly with the rabies of war. She labored for peace, when others did nothing, or—worse!—took up the sword to slay their fellow-men. She suffered for peace, when others were seeking the cheap rewards of war titles and decorations. Above all she has been honest, scorning to use her pacifism to justify the enormity of war. Indifferent alike to good and evil report, patient, compassionate, brave, the Christ-spirit again incarnate among men, she has gone steadfastly and modestly upon her way, a blessing unto men. If this woman does not deserve the Nobel Prize, who does? If she cannot win it, who would want to take it? Let all who endorse these sentiments, write to the Trustees of the Nobel Prize, in Stockholm, Sweden, that these honorable men may know that there are countrymen of Jane Addams who appreciate her worth, and would see it recognized while she still lives. The judgments of contemporaries are notoriously unsound, but here is one, we may be sure, which posterity would endorse.

Prophecies are interesting, especially when tested by later events. A friend has sent us an old yellowed clipping from the Boston *Transcript* of 1894, containing a pontifical editorial entitled "The Downfall of Debs." Speaking of his imprisonment for violation of the injunction of the United States government in the famous Pullman strike, the *Transcript* declared, these twenty-nine years ago, with solemn finality, "We opine that when Debs shall have served out his sentence, *he will disappear from public view and we shall hear very little of him.*" Since that time, Mr. Debs has lived to run three times for the presidency of the nation, in one of which campaigns he polled over a million votes, to stand as the dominant figure in the great Socialist movement in this country, and to go to prison again in vindication of the rights of men. Today, in his old age, he is beloved as no other man in America is beloved by millions of his fellow-citizens, is known and honored the world around as champion and martyr of human freedom, stands high among the few great figures among men today. In all these nearly thirty years, Debs's fame and influence have steadily grown, as they will continue to grow in the future when others of his more "respectable" contemporaries are long since forgotten. Other men active in 1894 have "disappear(ed) from public view," but not exactly Eugene V. Debs. The *Transcript,* in other words, read the signs of the time just a little awry. Now remember, please, that the same kind of brains write the *Transcript* editorials now that wrote them in 1894—nay, not the same, but a good deal worse!—and we have a fair estimate of what the opinions and prophecies of this paper are worth today.

Statistics are endlessly fascinating, and amusing—as we have said in these columns so many times before. We have just heard George Wharton James quoted as saying that the Indians in this country were rapidly decreasing in numbers, "notwithstanding the census, *which never is correctly taken!*" Now, why is this census never taken correctly, we wonder? Could any

statistical problem be more simple? The Indians are not scattered all over the landscape. On the contrary, most of them are closely gathered on government reservations. It would seem to be as easy to count them accurately as eggs in a basket. But it simply is not done, says Mr. James. The reason must be that nobody cares. Or else, *per contra,* that somebody cares very much indeed! We are inclined to think that the latter supposition is the correct one, for we have some public conscience on the Indian question these days, and it would not be healthy for any government to have it known that the Indians are dying out as rapidly now as they were a few years ago. But whatever the reason, here is the fact, given by one who knows, that official census figures are not to be trusted. They exaggerate on the side of optimism. Which is just what we have been saying for years about church statistics! Accurate? there is no such thing as accuracy in these amazing figures about new church members, increasing congregations, and the rest. Test them by any one specific instance anywhere, and you discover at once that something is wrong! Some time, when we have the leisure, we are going to investigate this problem—and we shall be surprised if we do not find a first-class sensation on our hands.

The death of Bishop Williams, of Michigan, following hard upon the death of William Austin Smith, editor of *The Churchman,* is a serious blow to the Episcopal church in this country. Indeed, it is far more than a blow to this one sect with which the Bishop was identified officially—rather is it a loss to religion, in the best and truest sense of that word, which members of all churches and of no church must mourn together. Dr. Williams was one of the few men since St. Ambrose who redeemed the title "bishop" from the ideas of cowardice, intolerance and inhumanity with which it has so long been unescapably associated. He had the courage of a Richard Cœur de Lion, sparing himself no blows, wounds or peril of death in battles for the right. He had tolerance, breadth of view, the spirit of understanding, and of course knowledge, which made impossible in his diocese such episodes as the Crapsey trial and the Grant controversy in the New York diocese. Above all, he had a humaneness which made him the untiring champion of the down-trodden and oppressed. The social gospel found in him an eager interpreter, the social applications of religion an ardent champion. He carried not only into his pulpit, but into the administration and leadership of an ecclesiastical organization peculiarly beset by reactionary and aristocratic influences, the vision and life of a new Christianity which he shared in common with men like Josiah Strong, Washington Gladden, and Walter Rauschenbusch. It is difficult to think of this vigorous and heroic man as dead. It is appalling to think of the church in America without his prophetic presence.

The Way of Life

"Production without Possession, Action without Aggression, Development without Domination; this is its mysterious operation." Twenty-five hundred years ago one of the world's timeless souls described in these words the way, the reason, the *logos,* what you will, the working of that perfect virtue beyond which there is nothing more. The great Chinese mystic stated for all time an ideal of individual and national living that is wholly foreign to the temper of the West. Yet to Lao Tzŭ's ideal we of the West must turn at last if in the fulness of time we are to be saved from our sins.

"Production without Possession." The very words sound to us almost irrational, to some of us indeed downright immoral. Shall not labor have the right to its own product, down to the last farthing? Our whole system of production is motived by possession, and we believe that men will not produce except in order to possess.

"Action without Aggression." Our very idea of action is aggression. Our hero is the man who does things, and the ruthlessness with which he overrides obstacles, whether of nature or of man, we not only excuse, but glorify as we contemplate the glorious result. Even our religion we cannot ourselves in quietness enjoy, to say nothing of practicing. Instead, as a matter of duty we must send our missionaries to convert others to our more excellent way. Quietness, modesty, toleration, understanding, and ceaseless activity always and only within these limits—all these things are for the most part as remote as China from the comprehension and practice of the western world.

In consequence we continually violate Lao Tzŭ's third maxim: "Development without Domination." In our industrial scheme the development of one competitor is scarcely to be attained except by the domination or even the destruction of others. Our political practice over a period of half a millennium has consisted of a series of ceaseless attempts to dominate other peoples, and our history in consequence is written in blood. Today, with the lessons of the great war fresh in mind, we still think and talk and act in terms of the necessity for foreign markets, for new sources of raw materials, for control of the sea-ways —in short, for domination of larger and larger parts of the earth's surface and greater and greater numbers of its population. And in our hearts we admire the man of dominant personality; it is Roosevelt, not Rolland, that is our hero. In individual and national life alike we wish for dominance. We damned the

apostles of *Kultur,* yet Americans today characteristically believe that the Monroe Doctrine means our right and duty to dominate the Western Hemisphere; and of those who wish to have us taking part in the affairs of Europe, nine out of ten desire such action in order that our superior morality may be imposed on the false and faithless statesmen of that aggressive, dominating, self-destroying continent.

To such a world of such men, the ancient Chinese philosopher speaks his word of quietness and wisdom and strength. It is a word for the individual and the state alike. If the state cannot yet be brought to its practice, none the less men individually can even today follow "the way" in serene confidence, in joy that cannot be taken away. What then is this mysterious quality of life that transcends all striving, that in itself is victory, even in the midst of overwhelming defeat? In the words of a great English Chinese scholar, it is "the simplicity of spontaneity, action (which might be called non-action) without motive, free from all selfish purpose, resting in nothing but its own accomplishment." To use Lao Tzŭ's own illustration from the processes of nature:

> All things spring up without a word spoken, and grow without a claim for their production. They go through their processes without any display of pride in them; and the results are realized without any assumption of ownership. It is owing to the absence of such assumption that the results and the processes do not disappear.

It is the internal as opposed to the external, the eternal as opposed to the temporal. It is perfect self-mastery, but it is greater than self-mastery because it dwells in a realm from which all thought of striving, all feeling of overcoming or of conquest has disappeared. To quote the last sentence of the Tăo Teh King,

> It is the Tăo—the way—of Heaven to benefit and not to injure; it is the Tăo—the way—of the sage to do and not to strive.

To do and not to strive! In view of such simplicity of life, how puny appear all our efforts at reform, all our strivings after individual and civic virtue, all our restless searchings after some new mode of action, some new social arrangement that will do away with the old sin. How inevitably are we reminded of the stars that said to Emerson's temperance reformer, "Why so hot, little sir?"

"It is the way of Tăo," says Lao Tzŭ, "not to act from any personal motive, to conduct affairs without feeling the trouble of them, to taste without being aware of the flavor, to account the great as small and the small as great, to recompense injury with kindness."

Manifestly this is no gospel of passivity or negation. It is but the plain statement of the working of a spirit too strong to feel the need of striving, too clear-eyed to attach importance to externals, too lofty to know bitterness in the inevitable defeat of life, too tranquil to find its profound calm disturbed by the ripples of circumstance, the little happenings of place and power, of success and failure. Out of such a spirit there flows a fountain of living water to refresh a parched and weary world, to cause a springing of fresh life in a desert of efforts and schemes and formulas. It is for such spirits that men are calling today as leaders and guides and prophets. It is such spirits that men may find it in themselves to be if once they will but give over their endless struggle to possess, to attack, to dominate, and will turn themselves to the task of being, and not forever striving simply to do. For in the deeper harmony of life that most of us struggle vainly to find we discover that being means production, means action, means development. He who traces out that harmony is no longer busied with fighting evil, but his life is none the less active on that account. He is producing forever that which it is in him to produce, because he must, because that is life, not because he would possess what he does not have. He is forever acting, but within his own life, and therefore within his due relations to those about him, not to compel or convert them, but letting life itself persuade. He develops forever, but not at cost of domination, because he is a part of a whole in which he cannot grow by starving the life and growth of the other parts, but only by being himself. He will not shout from the house-tops, yet he will have no fear of questioning the doctors in the temple. He will not seek for place or position or power, and if they come he will still be but himself. And through it all he will be glad, with a gladness that cannot be taken away, for such is the way of life. For though the earth be removed, and though the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea, yet still in quietness and in confidence shall be his strength, because he has found the way.

HENRY R. MUSSEY.

A SKETCH IN BLACK AND WHITE.

To-day it seems as if a mist
Had met the earth and they had kissed!
The right is seldom urged as right,
Black oft is gray, gray oft is white.

"Do unto others as ye would
That men should do to you." The Good
Is all herein embraced compact—
With naught remaining but to act.

Confucius taught it in the East,
And Jesus, lover of the least;
And none has since shown better way
To lead men to the sunlit day.

The world, to prosper, must not slack,
But recognize that black is black,—
Whereon will gleam Heaven's answering light,
With white alone emblazoned white.

JAMES HARCOURT WEST.

The United States in Foreign Affairs

Editorial Correspondence.

There is no great or difficult subject upon which the American mind is set at half-cock more often than the relation of our government to foreign peoples. What are foreign nations, except more or less menacing forces always likely in some way to injure us? What is our government for, except to defend us from danger abroad? What do our Army and Navy Departments exist for, unless it be to stand ready at all times to protect us and our interests? Why should we keep them, except as a city keeps its fire engines, namely, to be used on occasion? It does not occur to us that the nations of the world have the same need to apprehend peril from us and our mighty war enginery that we have to stand in guard against them. The history of America and her use of the "big stick" is not comfortable peace reading.

Moreover, our American business men are eager, effective, aggressive, stretching out their arms into every corner of the earth. How plausible to expect our State Department, with its consulates in the great ports of the earth, to help our merchants and promoters! What service do they exist for bigger than to expedite trade? Now, the record of the undertakings of only a few great business interests in the West Indies and the Latin-American states south of us is impressive. The modern development of the Monroe Doctrine—"America for the United States"—has actually become already an insidious peril to the liberties of millions of people. Without a vote in Congress, without any known agreement in the Cabinet of the President, with no public discussion, and hardly a notice in a newspaper paragraph, we have contrived to bring under our control the administration and the treasury of Haiti and Santo Domingo (not to carry the sinister story further), to land fighting men from war-ships, to kill native peoples, and with brazen audacity to assert our authority in lands upon which we have no claim or title. Surely the people of the United States swallowed a heavy dose of imperialistic poison when the Senate voted to appropriate the whole Filipino people by right of purchase!

Of course such things as these may be handsomely sugar-coated. How can any dusky people on earth be so free as by accepting the liberties we give our subjects? How can any native government manage its public treasury and pay its debts so comfortably, as when we send an American Commissioner to take care of their money? Grant that we must kill some of them; but would they not kill one another in greater numbers? Moreover, we may use some of their money to tidy up their towns and save baby-life. What would you have more wholesome for them? And yet, and yet! A remnant of simple mindedness in us still asks: By what right, national or international, divine or human, may the United States exercise authority over people outside its boundaries, and in the exercise of this assumed authority imprison them and put them to death? Is it an errand of neighborly brotherhood that takes governmental officials into alien territory and requires obedience of men of a language which we do not speak? Would the United States ever undertake this costly and delicate business if our nationals had no financial interests in these foreign countries? How much, for instance, could you raise for the education or the hygiene of the Philippine Islanders, if you had to get the money by passing the contribution box among our people?

These questions go to the root of our philosophy of government. We have no right blindly to evade them. We have no more right to mortgage our children with these colossal responsibilities and hazardous ventures, than our careless forefathers had to bring African slaves here to load the shoulders of generations to come with perplexity. Thus, when the other day the ill-assorted group of politicians who drew the Treaty of Versailles wanted the United States to take a mandate for the Armenians, it so appealed to our pity as well as to ancient religious prejudices that millions of kindly Americans would have hastily voted to accept it as a splendid missionary enterprise! Few of them were aware that there had been no Armenia for hundreds of years, or that the Armenians are scattered almost like the Jews over many provinces, a mere moiety of the population. People did not know the shabby story of the experience of the British government with the Armenians. No one knew or could know what a mandate for the Armenians meant.

Meantime a new and plausible appeal to our sympathies comes to us. In every country where men think it is known that the Versailles Treaty is an open wound draining the life of victors and vanquished alike. Desperate people abroad look to America; they insist that we ought to heal the sickness of the world. We blundered into the war and probably protracted immensely the cost and the suffering. Do we not owe something now to the world? Asia Minor also again calls upon us. Why not despatch troops and battleships over there? To what point? To do what? To kill the wicked Turks, of course. Then, what? Who knows? Who is wise or good enough to direct such an undertaking?

We are not saying a word to discourage sympathy with suffering nations. We are no "little Americans," who hold that we in the United States are self-sufficient. We never wished to see our nation stand aloof in the time of war—merely neutral in opinion or feeling or conduct. We wanted to help stop the war. We have no counsel now to sit at home and expect to cut the coupons on the debtor governments' bonds. On the contrary, we desire the closest internationalism; we wouldn't have a fort or a custom house on any frontier in the world.

What we object to is heedlessness and humbug and a shallow sympathy that barely hides the icy waters of bigotry and partisanship. What sort of sympathy do Americans feel for Armenians when they look on unfeelingly, while our own political prisoners suffer for their opinions? We object to a foreign policy of expediency without principle, of drifting, as we drifted into the Spanish War, and again lately when we shut our eyes to reason and conscripted our youth into a distant war? We object especially to the use of the means and weapons of violence. We do not want soldiers and diplomats; we want only lovers of men. Nothing but mercy and modesty and friendliness to all the peoples will heal their distress.

The fact is that a national government never was intended or organized for meddling with other people's affairs. A national government is not made to help in-

dividuals or corporations to do business at home or abroad. Hands off! It is not its duty to take its nationals in charge when they go abroad or undertake foreign risks. No government ever possessed wisdom, discretion, tact and humanity enough to manage its own quite limited operations. Look at Great Britain staggering under its preposterous imperial business, while its poor people at home have lived in squalor. What arrogance to think of governing its alien India without being able to provide the conditions of happiness in London, in Glasgow, in Dublin, in rural England! We in the United States have no superfluity of intelligence or character among our public men. Only a few of them would make a success in running a brick-yard. And yet people would have them legislate for Mexico and Anatolia.

No! The tremendous circumstances of the times call for something new, and fitting to the occasion. We need to summon from every people its wisest and best men and women, from the workers, the educators, the thinkers, the real leaders. We need such representatives as governments would not and could not select. We should commission them as our forefathers commissioned the Convention that made the Constitution. The occasion of their meeting would be too solemn to permit the show of egotism. We should give our commissioners no military to enforce their counsels; the use of violence should be made impossible. No group of favored nations should have a monopoly of control; Asiatics, the West Indians, the Turk, the Russian should be welcome. We should bid them all advise the waiting world outside what to do. Their advice would have only the weight which its good sense and kindliness could give it. Working chiefly in small committees, with the one end in view to serve equally all men and each nation, their way would not be so difficult as the tedious wranglings of decadent congresses and parliaments might lead us to suppose.

Finally, we can make an exception to the general rule as to the limited scope of a national government. The situation doubtless calls for the scaling down of all the colossal war debts of the world. They represent nothing but the working of mischief. They ought not to be suffered to oppress the next generation. Just here is the evident necessity for the generosity of the people of the United States. We must be ready by some sort of plebiscite to do more than our part. This will also be good business, as the policy of brotherhood always is. We should literally forgive our debtors, and in so doing enable the world also to forgive. What if nothing less than this can purchase relief from the ancient strife, hatred and bitterness which plunged us all into the horrid maelstrom of the war?

Honolulu, Hawaii. CHARLES F. DOLE.

Berlin Notes

Let me give you bits from a conversation I had with a young German—one of the men sure to exercise influence in the future. He is now busy in relief work. His wife is American, and the two make a couple of whom any city would be proud.

"Let me show you how and why people suffer in Germany," he said, "on account of the falling mark. I took a little silver pencil to be mended. It was my wife's. On going for it, the silversmith said it would be two and a half marks. I gasped and said, 'Why, it costs fifty marks to take a street car ride.' 'Yes, but it took me only a quarter of an hour to mend it.' This silversmith's mind could not adjust itself to the swift change in value." My friend paid him fifty marks and he was quite overcome.

"What do you think," I asked, "about Russia and Germany combining? Germany has the skill and method, Russia has the raw material." "I am not anxious," he replied, "for such a combination, for it would make Germany the battlefield of Europe." "But," said I, "it would be possible to turn interest eastward toward Asia, and then the battlefield would not be in Germany." "Maybe, but I don't want a battlefield anywhere!"

When I congratulated him on the working habits, the cleanliness and frugality of Germans—I had just come from Russia and I had heard of no one charging Russians with efficiency—and said I did not see how Russia could ever hold her own in competition with Germany. "Yes," he said, with a shade of sadness, "but Russia has time for ideas, as it was in the days of Goethe and idealism. It is quite likely that Russia is not so efficient, but she may have more soul," and then he went on to speak of "the great opportunity of the United States to influence the world for good," and I asked myself when I thought of "Babbitt" whether we had much to give the world beside efficiency and mechanism.

Let me relate an incident which may be said to be characteristically German. I was walking along Friedrichstrasse—a crowded thoroughfare—when a passing policeman greeted me with a smile, "There is a little mud on your overcoat"; evidently when mounting an omnibus, my coat had swung against a wheel. The policeman thought it part of his duty—there was no rebuke in it—to keep the people "tidied up." Here is another. Later, I was reading several documents to a group, when having finished reading one, I put it on the floor, near my chair, it being most convenient. Immediately, the maid of the hotel, passing through the room, sprang forward, caught up the document from the floor, got a little stool, which she placed near me, and there carefully laid the document on it. Let everything be "done in order" is characteristically German. It extends to the concert halls. One is not permitted to take his hat or overcoat or cane into the hall; they must be checked by one of the many check women in the lobby. Every one also must be in his seat a few minutes before the performance begins. Otherwise, he may have the pleasure of cooling his shins in the outer darkness, until the first act is over. The only thing that seems to be out of order at a concert or opera, is the rather common habit of people taking out a brown bread sandwich, with butter or sausage, and slowly munching it between acts. Hunger is not back of this; for it is a pre-war custom. It is not a social meal, for each one nibbles at his own sandwich which he carefully draws out of his pocket. This, too, is done with method.

Speaking of concerts leads me to speak of the feasts of music that are spread for the public. For example, I went during Christmas week to what is known as the Children's Opera, *"Hänsel und Gretel,"* in the State Theater. It is an event in the lives of many children, the giving of this opera during Christmas week. This theater was packed, half with children.

How much I would give to have all America look upon the scene! Whatever embers of hatred are still burning would certainly be put out! The "sand man," putting the lost Hänsel and Gretel to sleep in the woods. The "morning dew" opening their eyes in the morning. The prayer of the children for the angels. The old witch—the "Ginger bread woman." The saying of the father, "In greatest danger pray, and you will get help." It is impossible to look at the children of any nation and hate their fathers.

Another concert was given last night, the 29th, in the *Sing Akademie*. It was given by the Klinger Quartet. This quartet, I understand, is an institution. The founder of the quartet, the father, is now dead, but the quartet goes on in his sons. As a matter of fact, the first half of the program was by a septet (violin, bratsche, horn, clarinet, fagott, violoncello, contrabass), and was all Beethoven. This second half was by an octet, in which two violins participated, and was all Schubert. I am not quite a pagan in music, although I am not a technician. I just drink it in, as I eat a *table d'hôte* dinner. I had no difficulty in discovering that Schubert was a greater genius than Beethoven, just as I know that Browning is greater than Wordsworth. Again, I could but wish that all America could have looked in upon *Sing Akademie* last night. The audience, the music, suggested quite the opposite of degeneracy and hunnishness. It was all made in Germany—composers, musicians, audience. It would of course be impossible for America or England to duplicate anything quite in this class!

There is one thing, however, that causes me to wonder. While Germans are so famous, and rightly, for their music—in composition, in interpretation, in education—they do not seem to be a singing people. I have seldom heard anyone sing or whistle or even hum, in daily work; I understand that they are not at this time in a singing mood, with half empty stomachs and their money standard almost submerged into bankruptcy. Who would sing? Yet, as I recall pre-war days, they do not seem to be a singing people—like Italians or Negroes. It is best not to generalize in such matters: yet this is my impression. If I am correct, this singless condition may be due to years of militarism. It may be due to their having made a science of music and to their passion for order, which leads me to remark, that I am convinced that Berlin is one of the best ordered, most civilized cities in the world. What impresses me is that the whole social machinery seems to be set up to make life comfortable and well ordered.

I will illustrate what I mean by reference to the small block, in which I live. I have reason to believe that life all over the city is just as well organized as is the life of our block. At every street corner of our block are one or more signs, framed in iron, clearly giving the names of the streets; also on the post the numbers of the houses in adjoining blocks. And then, in numbering the houses, which is done uniformly, and by means of big black letters, on white enamel background, there is under each number an arrow indicating the way the numbers run. There are two letter boxes for our block—heavy iron boxes. There is on one side of our block a swift botor bus, with two-minute service. On the other side is a trolley line, with cars plainly numbered, and running frequently. For our block are two attractive cylinder bill boards for amusement notices—taking the place and doing ten times the service rendered by American bill boards. On these cylinders—12 feet high and four feet in diameter—there are the street car time tables with their routes, and I was pleasantly surprised to note that in little conspicuous squares were given the location of the police station, the fire station and the hospital (in case of accident). Adjoining our block is a market house, and I need not say that it is clean and architecturally attractive. And I might go on. It would seem as if some scientific and benevolent mind had worked out the needs of the people in the block, and that the city had provided for them.

In the midst of all this order and provision for human needs, evidences are very common of the immense need of the multitudes of people for bare necessities of life. A month or two ago I asked one who mingles with all classes of people, what the daily bill of fare was for the majority of the people of Berlin. Here is what he mentioned: "Two or three slices of brown bread, spread with margarine, with barley water for breakfast. For luncheon, one or two margarine sandwiches. For supper vegetable and potato soup, brown bread and barley water—while the most fortunate of the majority have meat once a week." I have confirmed this statement, by the testimony of others, and am inclined to think it is correct. With such a bill of fare there is naturally great suffering mingled with dread in Berlin.

Alongside this goes a show of luxury and high living in conspicuous places, that is disquieting. Among these are many foreigners whose money goes three to ten times as far as it does at home. Some of the citizens are speculating and spending proportionately. I go about in the restaurants and find hundreds eating and drinking as they did in the days of Noah. If these spenders would only eat half as much, there would be much food for the hungry. But, it is too much to ask that the German Dives shall take more notice of Lazarus, than the New York and London Dives. Meantime, 500,000 children in Germany are being daily fed by public charity. And those who have hearts to give cannot give too much.

Speaking of foreigners or *Ausländers*—these naturally constitute a source of irritation. People who are poor in America are rich in Germany. One can live like a lord in Berlin on $50 or $100 a month, with street car fare at three-quarters of a cent, and a room (a good one) for 25 cents a day. I asked what was the railway fare to Cologne—I had thought of visiting the occupied territory—and found that I could go for a twelve hours' ride in a fast express, with sleeper, all included for less than a dollar. One simply can't get used to it! All this dreadful disparagement in standards—between Germany and America—is sure to cause friction. The *Auslander* cannot fail, by degrees, to assume the airs of a lord, and the citizens are considering ways and means of getting the *Auslander* to pay more. This is successful to a small extent. For example, a friend writing from Frankfort, said she had been at the opera on a ticket costing 12,520 marks, while the German price for the same was 870 marks. I heard one of Wagner's operas in Berlin, for 4,400 marks, while my seat mate (a citizen) paid 880. Quite naturally, shopkeepers are getting higher prices from *Ausländers* when possible. Added to this, is a class of travelers who get the "gambling" or "bargain" habit, and are liable to think that they are being fleeced.

One of my German friends is very much disturbed over the problems that tourists arouse. He said, that after the war, when America began to feed the people,

especially the children (there was scarcely a home, with children that was untouched by American generosity), the American people held a very large place in the affections of the people. They were looked upon by many as angels of mercy. But when the flood of tourists came last summer—many of them Americans—much of the sentiment was destroyed and some bitterness was engendered. My friend said that his countrymen were frequently unreasonable, that they could not always understand the needs of the tourists, and then he said he hoped that all Americans would remember that the German people had experienced four years of war, and four years of peace that were as trying as war, and naturally they did not see and act quite normally.

2nd January, 1923. SYDNEY STRONG.

Does a Universal Religion Necessitate Religious Uniformity?

A Reply to Dr. Holmes.

Some twenty-three hundred years ago, the last of the Hebrew Prophets, said in the name of God, "From the rising of the sun, even unto the going down of the same, My Name is great among the nations; and in every place, offerings are presented unto My Name, even pure oblations; for My Name is great among the nations, saith the Lord of hosts." Thus spoke Malachi. And in thus speaking, he described the universal religion that, in some form, exists at all times. It was a remarkable statement for him to make. He belonged to a people that has been criticized as clinging most tenaciously to its racial consciousness. He was one of the makers of a religion that has been condemned by many as narrow and exclusive and therefore, as inconsistent with a religion that should minister to universal humanity. And yet he was capable of saying what he did. This shows that the critics who condemn Judaism as too narrow a religion, do not understand it. Malachi's conception of liberalism and universalism in religion, is as true to-day as it was in his time. It is the only conception that is really applicable to the conditions of life to-day. For, see what this Prophet of Jehovah, of the Jew's God, Who is at the same time, the God of mankind, implies. He tells the Priests of the Temple in Jerusalem that they must not think that they are the only ones that are ministering unto God. They might be conceived as answering: it is through Israel, that the revelation of the true God was made, that the nations of their time were sunk in Polytheism and idolatry. And yet the Prophet says, in the name of God, "great is My Name among the nations; and from East to West, everywhere, offerings are presented unto Me, even pure oblations." What the Prophet teaches is, that in some form, men and women are seeking and finding the one true God. And if their search be sincere, and if their experience be real and spiritually fruitful, then with their religious sentiment, they are, however erroneous their creed, however inadequate their symbol, however forbidding their ritual, really bringing the heart's homage to the only One. For there is only one God, the Divinity that wooes and wins our souls. Liberal religion does not mean condemnation of any religious manifestation. It is of the spirit of "live and let live." It trusts to education. And universal religion does not mean religious uniformity. In proportion, as life is manysided, uniformity does not mean progress, but retrogression. Men differ in intellect, in imagination, in temperamental needs, men differ, if you will, in racial origins, which color the name of artificial unification, is not to foster freedom, progress and real spiritual life, which must follow the law of differentiation. It is to encourage reaction and to make men a colorless mass, swayed by blind emotions.

I have been led to choose this theme because of my having read a most interesting article in the "American Israelite," reproduced from UNITY, by the Rev. Dr. John Haynes Holmes. Let me make myself clear at the start. There are few men in this city for whom I have higher regard than I have for the honesty, sincerity and idealism of Mr. Holmes. But in this article he is entirely mistaken, and I am compelled to meet his challenge. He puts the question and wants an answer: "Is it possible for Jew and Christian to work and worship together, for Church and Synagogue, to be combined into one great community institution of religion?" He believes that it is. It is his ideal of religious organization. He has convinced himself of its possibility, nay necessity, because of the things he sees about him. He undertakes to describe Jewish conditions, as he sees them in this city. He tells us there are three classes of Jews. There are first, the "unchurched." They are of the sixty percent of the people of this country, who, he claims, never pass inside the doors of a House of Worship. Some of them may come to the Synagogue on the Holy Days, as some Christians, under like influences, go to church on Easter Sunday. At the "opposite pole," he tells us, there are the "Orthodox Jews." "Very beautiful is their spirit of devotion," he says. "Even if it is unprogressive, it gives dignity to this venerable faith." "Lastly, there are," he tells us, "the so-called Liberal Jews, who, like the liberal Christians, have broken away from creeds and practices of Orthodoxy, but still believe in the reality of religion. They are familiar with the latest developments of science and philosophy, they are open-minded and creative in relation to all the current problems of the day." "Do these three groups exhaust the world of American Jewry?" he asks. Not at all. There is a fourth class, recently uncovered in his experience, when organizing the Community Church of New York. He organized a church, he tells us, taking for unit of integration, nothing theological or ecclesiastical. Simply and solely, the community in which we live. Anybody who is a citizen of the community, was a member of the church, if he desired to recognize and use his membership. "Knowing not sect, class, nation or race," was his watchword. "The logic of this declaration," he says, "was the definite abandonment of Christianity as one particular form of organized religion. And we did not evade this logic." I am quoting his exact words. "We took the name of Jesus from our covenant, and thus sought definite release from all that fell short of a genuinely universal faith." "The bulk of the membership still remains Gentile. But immediately," he says, with joy and pride, "there came and are still coming, Jewish men and women." And he describes this class of people. He tells us that "these Jews seek no escape from the burdens and sufferings of their race, make no concealment of their blood and tolerate no severance from the society of their kindred.

They feel themselves Jews, and in noble pride, would have the world know that they are Jews." Why do they come to him? Because, he tells us, "they see no more reason why a religious institution should be built inside the lines of race, than inside the lines of creed or custom. They are as impatient of a racial Orthodoxy, as of an institutional Orthodoxy." Then he goes on to say, that their response to his religious movement is because it takes men simply as men, and embraces them in a fellowship as broad as humankind. He reflects upon this phenomenon and says, he can well understand that such Jews may be taken as a "symptom of that racial disintegration which is so greatly feared by those noble men and women who feel intensely that racial consciousness which springs from centuries of persecution, borne with unparalleled heroism and fidelity." "But to me, be it confessed, these Jews, whatever they may manifest on the racial side, manifest on the human side a portend of blessed significance." And he is "eager to know how the discovery of this group of Jews, impresses the average Jew among us."

As an average Jew, I consider it my duty to attempt to give him the answer. And I wish first to point out certain implications in his statement, which are erroneous. I deny that the universality of a religion depends on its independence of any particular method of perpetuating it, of any particular creed or symbol or ceremonial, or principle of organization. In my opinion, the universality of a religion depends upon its hospitality. A universal religion is a religion that claims to bring a message to all mankind and is sufficiently hospitable to receive those who, in good faith, come and wish to accept it and identify themselves with the organization which expresses it. I resent the intimation that Judaism, in its present form, is not a universal religion, even as Christianity would have a perfect right to resent the suggestion of Mr. Holmes that it is not universal, because of its characteristic beliefs. There is, as indicated by the Prophet Malachi, whom I now interpret in modern phraseology, there is in existence to-day, one universal Church. It is invisible. It is made up of the souls of men and women, who sincerely cling to God and live according to their best light, the life of truth, of righteousness and loving service. These men and women are found in all denominations. This is my way of looking at the universality of religion. This is my interpretation of liberal-mindedness, while judging from the vantage ground of my own religious affiliation, those who belong to other churches. This invisible Church must however break up into divisions. These divisions are good, because they foster individuality. They make men emerge from an undifferentiated mass of jelly into distinct individualities, with clearly held beliefs and strong convictions. These divisions only become tainted with evil, if they degenerate into fanaticisms and bigotries. To cure them of evil, it is neither wise nor necessary to destroy them. They must be educated. The spirit of liberalization must be from within. Tearing up people by their roots from their inherited past, does not conduce to their spiritual culture, and often puts asleep their conscience, in so far as they are misled into violating loyalties which they are called upon to uphold.

Furthermore, I deny the truth, or the value of the assumption, that a church based on the mere idea of common residence in a community, is the most adequate expression of universalism, is more inclusive than any other. It is something new and queer to make of mere propinquity, a principle. I do not know the details of the belief, or the religious practice of the Community Church, but from this article upon which I am basing my discourse, I assume that the Church stands for the worship of God. It is therefore a Theistic Church. Something, I should say, like what years ago was organized in England. And in this free land, thanks to the principle of separation of Church and State, there is room for any kind of organization. That is the glory of our land, that perfect freedom is given to diversity of religions, to men's worship of God according to their conscience. But I deny that such a theistic church is necessarily more universal than our Judaism, or than Christianity in its various forms. Does not Mr. Holmes see that what he calls an inclusive principle, immediately acts as a force of exclusion for millions in this city? Does he not see that by giving up Christianity, and, as he says, taking the name of Jesus from the covenant of the church, he makes it impossible for millions of citizens of this great community to worship with him? I do not blame him for this. On the contrary, there is a point of view from which I welcome his convictions. And with respect to certain consequences which might follow from his convictions, I will have something to say before closing this discourse. I only point out now, that by the mere fact of his organization, he is just as necessarily exclusive towards certain elements of the community, as are other churches. His is only one more church and can make no claim for inclusiveness. Because to join him, not merely as an occasional hearer, but as a member, means to encourage the destruction of beliefs which many hold sacred.

I deny that "fellowship" is necessarily dependent upon a Community Church. "Togetherness," a phrase he likes, is not the only thing, as he seems to believe, that constitutes the reality of religion. There is a time for "togetherness" and there is a time for separateness. Life is both differentiation, as well as integration. "Togetherness" itself, is a colorless term. The importance of it consists in the purpose for which people get together. Men get together in corporations. Men get together for purposes of social service. Men get together for purposes of political action. Men get together for pleasant and harmless and helpful enjoyment of social entertainment. Men get together for every purpose under the sun. Men even get together to steal. Thieves have unions too. And it is true that the mere fact of bringing people together, has some ethical value. On the other hand, if get-together, without considering the purpose, is made the supreme virtue, it reduces humanity to the qualities of a herd of cattle. It does not promote the larger unity underlying the necessary wealth of varieties. Now, religion when sincerely held, when influencing the whole of life, the intellect, the conscience, the imagination, the will, is something so exquisitely personal and intimate, that it is the most intensely individual thing. And when, in order to become a social force, it organizes individuals into what is called churches, it must necessarily produce a variety of them. So in the Community Church, people are getting together for one purpose, and in other churches and in the synagogue, they are getting together for another purpose. But let me say that in the spirit of the ancient Hebrew Prophet Malachi, even while these various organizations jealously guard their individuality, because of their convictions, with which they would not compromise, they can still

be worshipping in sincerity and truth, the Father of mankind, who is indeed, the source of our unity and who made us diverse.

Now I come to the kernel of his argument, to that which concerns me most, as a teacher of Judaism. I consider his teaching the greatest danger to the mass of Jewry in this great city, with its unwieldy and religiously not sufficiently organized Jewish community. For the intimation in his movement is that it is a counsel of perfection for the Jew to leave his historic heritage and merge himself in this new Community Church. He considers those Jews who do it, a "portend of blessed significance." Let me point out the contradiction in the twofold statement of Mr. Holmes, that these Jews, as he describes them, do not seek to escape from the burdens and sufferings of their race, that in noble pride, they would have the world know that they are Jews. And yet at the same time, he tells us that they may be taken as a symptom of racial disintegration. Now, if they take such a "noble pride" in being Jews, why do they leave their Jewish heritage and contribute to disintegration? I would not pass judgment upon any human being. God is the searcher of hearts, and man has no right to question the motives of his fellowman, especially in such an intensely personal matter as religion. But I would venture to say that perhaps I may understand these Jews a little better than Mr. Holmes understands them. After all, it requires just as much heroism to-day to remain in the household of Israel, as it did in former ages. As a minority religion, we are still exposed in very benighted lands, to hostility, to persecution, to the threat of destruction. Even in the most liberal lands, to prejudice, to misunderstanding, to ostracism. Mr. Holmes knows this as well as I. The pressure on the Jew is great. We need the strength of character to resist this pressure as much to-day, and perhaps even more, because of the temptations and allurements of to-day, as we did at any time in our history. May it not be just barely possible that these Jews, since Mr. Holmes claims to have given up Christianity and dropped the name of Jesus from his covenant, find it the easiest way to lose themselves in the mass and thus throw away the burden which history has imposed upon them? If not in the first generation, certainly in the second generation, this will be the fact. May it not be possible that less holy motives than the mere quest for a more spiritual religion, may be unconsciously driving them? And a man of idealism like Dr. Holmes, ought to give some thought to this aspect of the question.

But I deny that these Jews have a right to say that they are compelled to seek a more spiritual religion outside of Israel, because the religion of the synagogue, forsooth, is held "inside the lines of race." Judaism is not a racial religion. It is well known that from this pulpit and from the overwhelming majority of pulpits of Reform Congregations in this land, it is clearly taught and emphasized that Judaism is neither a national nor a racial religion. Judaism is a universal religion, carried in history by a distinct, historic religious community, the household of Israel, to which everyone is welcome. And the Jewish law, governing not only Reform Congregations, but Orthodox Congregations too, has been for the last two thousand years, such as to accept any man or woman of Gentile origin, without distinction of race or color, when they come in good faith. Judaism does not force itself upon any one. It does not make salvation dependent upon creed, but it hospitably receives and welcomes any one that comes to it. If Israel has, thus far, been the group that has stood in history, uncompromisingly for the truths of one God, one humanity and the Law of righteousness, which must be obeyed as the highest service that we can give to God, if its refusal to lose itself in the majority, has cost it matchless suffering, that does not mean that Israel is exclusive. It means that it is conscious of its service to the Divinity that, through the genius of Israel, did choose it. No Jew or Jewess is hurt religiously by remaining within Judaism. Within Judaism, we hold that the purest form of communion between the soul and its Father in heaven, the Universal God of all sincere hearts, can be found. If, therefore, men and women seek to separate themselves from Israel, it cannot be only for spiritual reasons. Pure spiritual-mindedness, the fine fruit and flower of a sensitive conscience, of a real worship of God, and of a deep sense of duty, would keep them in the household in which they were born, and make them generously share in the sublime charge which Providence in history has entrusted to the Jew.

Mr. Holmes' description of the classes of Jews is not altogether correct. He calls such synagogues as ours, liberal synagogues. He refers to Liberal Judaism. Personally, I prefer the technical term, "Reform Judaism," to Liberal Judaism. There is a touch of arrogance in ascribing to one's self the designation of a Liberal. And I would not so describe certain differences of opinion which differentiate me from my Orthodox brethren. The Reform movement began as a movement of adjustment of the Jew to the modern world and to modern conditions of life. Reform means changed forms. It has not the connotation of "improvement," according to the origin of the word in Germany, where our movement arose. That is why we do not like the phrase ignorantly used, of "Reformed Jews." Here in America, the Reform movement has celebrated its highest triumphs, and has indeed, created quite an individual thing, American Judaism. But I hold, that Orthodox Judaism is not at all incompatible with science, with philosophy, with a broad-minded and progressive attitude to the social questions of the day. There are ladies and gentlemen in America, who are strict Orthodox Jews and yet are thoroughly abreast of modern culture. And I can conceive an Orthodox Jew, who is strictly observant of all the ancient laws and ceremonies and forms, and yet is a liberal, because liberalism is a matter of temperament, of charity of mind, of wise religious insight. Our history is rich in philosophers who were uncompromisingly Orthodox in their Jewish practice. I felt that this was necessary to say in order to be just to Orthodoxy. We, in Reform Congregations, believe that the future is with us. Life is making more or less impossible the preservation of Judaism in an absolutely rigid and uncompromising form of Orthodoxy. But on the other hand, we believe, as far as I can speak for Reform Judaism in America, that if our religion is to be perpetuated, it cannot tear itself away from great historic institutions like the Sabbath and Holy Days, and from symbols which appeal to the imagination. That in short, it must be revitalized, from time to time, by drinking deep from the living waters of our great historic tradition.

Tradition is a vital fruitful influence. Mr. Holmes emphasizes "to-day," as against "yesterday." But I believe the "yesterday" is in our blood and in our soul. Life is a rush of the creative yesterday through the

fleeting to-day into the richer to-morrow. A wise life does not self-sufficiently and anarchically begin with the present. It utilizes the past for the future, Judaism and Israel have a great past, and we hope for a greater future. That past determines our destiny as Jews. The doctrine that Israel was chosen by God, through the mysterious gift of its religiously creative genius, is justified by the facts of history. The Western World, including Mr. Holmes, lives religiously by the ideas revealed through Israel. This doctrine is the driving force of our hopes and the power that has preserved us. It is the *raison d'etre* of our historic continuity and mission.

I cannot now go into a description of the contents of Judaism as a distinctive religion. But I merely wish to say in this connection that because Mr. Holmes has given up Christianity and removed Jesus from his covenant, is no reason why Jews and Jewesses, who understand their religion and its spiritual power, must betray their heredity and lose themselves in the new environment which he is attempting to create for them. Judaism, as a religion, does not exist *only* because it differs from Christianity, as a sort of protest. To adopt the thought of Maimonides, it sees in Christianity a great moral and spiritual force, preparing men for the Kingdom of God. But Judaism itself is true to its own covenant, the covenant of a people that was to be the "light of the nations." It has a positive message of its own. And some of its teachings of justice and right, differ very much from some of the ethical misconceptions and social heresies of the glorified "to-day." Jews, therefore, when they turn their backs upon Judaism, not only leave a heritage which is a great *noblesse oblige*, and faithfulness to which shows a fine generous spirit, as long as there is one Jew in the world who is persecuted and hated, because he is a Jew, but they leave a religion, which I venture to say has the best answer to give to the modern perplexed mind.

And after all, to come to practical consequences, what is Mr. Holmes really doing with respect to those Jews whom he is taking out of Judaism? He claims to have given up Christianity and to have removed Jesus from the covenant. But he cannot so easily destroy the "yesterday" in himself and in the Gentile element in his Church. In the main, he is governed by the religious consciousness of Christendom in his mental habits. Above all, he defers to the majority in the selection of his holy days as symbols of religious ideas. For example, he celebrates Christmas and Easter. I suppose he will try and put new meanings into these days, in accordance with his new theological ideas. But subjective interpretations of institutions pass away with the man who makes them. The institutions remain. I am modest enough to believe that historical categories are more powerful than individuals. Mr. Holmes is not going to celebrate the Day of Atonement, despite its sublime message of human sin and God's love and forgiveness. Why? Not because he sat down and reasoned it out, that Christmas and Easter are superior to it, or because he cannot ethically and spiritually utilize the Day of Atonement, which, as a matter of fact, is an institution, breathing a spirit of universalism and of the purest religion. No, it is not a matter of reasoning; it is a matter of sentiment, and deference to the majority, when he decides for the Christian and not for the Jewish day. Therefore, he is simply leading the Jews and Jewesses, who become members of his Church, to defer to the majority, only because it is the majority, and to drop their own holy days and give assent to the Christian consciousness. The next generation will find their children, in all probability, in good Orthodox Christian churches. He has facilitated their flight from a besieged and distressed city. He has not encouraged them in heroic and noble steadfastness. He has helped them in their self-delusion.

This he should not do, not only for the sake of the integrity of the spiritual life, but for the sake of that very liberalism and fellowship in which he is interested. I hope he will not misunderstand me as depreciating his worth, for whom I have always had a high regard, when I say that his Community Church and other forms of "liberal Christianity," to use the technical term, are weak and small, as compared with the great power of the historic Orthodox Churches in Christendom, certainly small as compared with the forces of materialism and irreligiousness evidenced in the world's conditions to-day. Is it good for him to help the tendency to disintegration of the Jew? Has not the Jew been the martyr of the ages? Has not Israel, a very small community, dared to face a whole world for its religious convictions? And is it not better that "liberalism" retain a citadel within the great historic household of the Jew, than to undermine the Jewish heritage and to seek to destroy the Jew's historic continuity in the service of the One God?

I might, in all seriousness, say to him, if you have given up Christianity and removed Jesus from the covenant, why do you not, as did some fine spirits of the Gentile world, in the course of our history, come to the household of Israel, identify yourself with the Jew and accept Judaism as a religion? Does it not appeal to what is just and generous and chivalrous in a great soul, to identify one's self with a faith and to accept a name, which to-day is mocked and despised, hated and persecuted? But we do not ask this. We would not thrust our beloved burden upon others. But we do claim that it is not only no spiritual gain, on the contrary, it means a moral impoverishment for Jews and Jewesses to give up this burden with the pretense, forsooth, that their racial heritage mars their spiritual life.

Above all, we hold that neither universalism, nor liberalism, nor fellowship in religion requires this giving up of Judaism. Jews we remain. Thus far, no one in history, not excluding the greatest and the best, has been able to destroy Judaism. It has survived. It has suffered many defections from the weak-kneed, the faint-hearted, the self-seeking, who have dropped out. It has lost some who thought they had outgrown the covenant, to whose spirit they were not morally great enough to rise. We remain loyal to our task. But we recognize the possibility of spiritual honesty and beauty in all organized forms of religion. We claim fellowship with all the beautiful souls in all denominations, no matter what differences of belief, of symbol and of practice separate us. The sincere and the good are in a great fellowship with all the sincere and the good wherever they may be found. We are already "together" in spirit, though we must walk our separate ways in visible religion, for the sake of truth and duty, as we conceive them. And we know that the universal religion already exists wherever good men and women do justice, love mercy and walk in humility with God. "For My Name is great among the nations and in every place, offerings are presented unto My Name, saith the Lord of hosts." SAMUEL SCHULMAN.

THE STUDY TABLE

"A Receivership for Civilization"

A RECEIVERSHIP FOR CIVILIZATION, by Duren J. H. Ward (A.M., Harvard; B. D., Hillsdale; Ph. D., Leipsic).

This book asks the church to go into a receivership. It asks science to take up the task on which the church is not making good. It believes that if the church will recognize the modern prophets and will tell the truth about the world and God and man, it can win back its lost prestige.

We have here a curious book, in many ways. It is called by some readers the severest critique ever pronounced upon the church. Yet it pays a tribute to the church's past so high that at first one wonders why criticize such a grand institution? But it completely reconstructs both doctrine and method. The "Creed of Science" and the "Collegiate Church" are outstanding features. Even the dedication intimates the point of view and the purpose: "To Men of Religion: The World's former trust, the Time-honored source of goodness; To Men of Science: The World's new Hope, the Modern fount of knowledge. May the one get the facts and the other the zeal that shall save their common charge—Civilization."

Christianity is surveyed as a drama, played in five acts:

I. Jesu-anity, Discipleship—submissive imitation of a superior character. This developed into Jesu-olatry. Its period was from A. D. 30-325.

II. Christ-ianity, dogma about that personality—his elevation to the Godhead—Christ-iolatry, from A. D. 325-600.

III. Church-ianity, devotion to the all-powerful organization in the name of the all-powerful person or his representative in the Pope, God's Vice-Regent—servility to the Ecclesia in Church-iolatry. From A. D. 600-1517.

IV. Bibl-ianity, The Great Revolt, the Protest, the appeal to The Book, back to the first ancient authority—Re-form-ation—Protestant-ism ending in Bibl-iolatry. From 1517-1830.

V. Science, further protest resulting in freedom from all dependence on any former authority, supplanting discipleship, dogmatism, ecclesiasticism and book tyranny from 1830-1922 and further.

This book analyzes the Bible as the authority of former times, it epitomizes the work of the "Higher Criticism." It gladly acknowledges the "Beauties of the Old Bible." It tears to shreds the former theories of inspiration, and it quotes so many defects that some people will be tempted to doubt whether there is any value left.

It paints the portraits of the old-time preacher 'mid the new-time needs, and the new-time preacher with the new-time facts. It outlines those new-time facts and shows the substituted authority of science that has nearly occupied the twentieth century mind. It calls the body of science "The New Bible" and divides it into books. It gives a marvelous array of the writers of this "New Bible" of the modern time. It shows how the "inscrutible mysteries" of former times have dissolved before the light of this new inspired knowledge. The problems of Evil, Moral Sanctions, God, Prayer and Worship are not merely re-explained, but the way is shown for their new applications to life. "The Old Worship and The New" are contrasted in striking manner and with a sympathy that will be satisfying to very many people.

Religion is interpreted in a way so broad as to cover all the religions. It is not a set of doctrines. It is not a belief or a trust in a book. It is noble earnestness. It is man leaning forward. It is life made serious by lofty purpose. This, science can furnish better than the traditions of yesterday. Indeed, for the first time in history is there now a change for a real, a true, a lofty religion. It gets at the heart of all religions and gives the content of the latest possibility in religion. It gives full credit to each faith of the past and shows how inadequate they are for today.

The book reaches a climax in the entreaty for the clergy to learn today's truths and make them the basis for today's religion. Ancient Jewish concepts were primitive. They were often high yearnings, but we need our own still higher yearnings dressed up in the thought of our own immeasurably grander times. It calls upon science to take more interest in life. The men of science must make their great truths popular. They must proclaim the great facts and laws and make them so plain that the preachers will be obliged to fall in line.

The victory is won. The times are ripe. The old view has lost its power. It is not longer a sufficient basis for conduct. Crime is increasing. Thousands are yielding to the ancient, primitive instincts. This is taking place on racial and national scales. Civilization is trembling. Religion has always heretofore been a brake on the biological inheritance of man. Today it is ineffective. Science must come to the rescue with higher truths. Its reticence is inviting peril. The way is open. The world everywhere else welcomes science. It will welcome it in the fields of mind, morals and religion, if we ministers will preach it.

Dr. Ward's work is in full accord with the spirit of many other recent books that are pronounced to be of the highest merit. Its purpose and spirit have been compared with Wells' "Outline of History," Ross' "Principles of Sociology," Patrick's "Psychology of Nationalism and Internationalism," Humphrey's "The Racial Prospect," Carpenter's "Pagan and Christian Creeds," Platt's "Psychology of Thought and Feeling," and Stoddard's "The Revolt against Civilization." Some readers say that Dr. Ward's book points the practical way out of the evils which these and many other writers portray.

Dr. Ward's attitude on social problems is indicated by the quotations which he makes from other writers and from his statements in the "Scientist's Creed." He cites severe passages arraigning the social order from Dr. Lyman Abbott, from Rev. DuBois Loux, from Thomas A. Edison, Frederick Townsend Martin, and Professor William Herbert Carruth. These and his own statements in the chapter entitled "Scientific Doctrine Imperative Now" form a mighty climactic appeal for a better social justice.

In the "Creed of Science," Article VI, he says,

I believe in Mankind—the highest life on earth, born in lowliest simplicity (a million years ago), but with "divine" potentiality, taught by experience, with the ages ever reaching greater results, never perfected, always aspiring, always growing.

Article XI says,

I believe in the Oneness of Nature, so also in One Human Family, biologically and ethnically related, impelled by the same basic instincts, engaged in an age-long diminishing con-

THE FIELD

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion"

GENERAL DEFENSE COMMITTEE.

HARRY FEINBERG, *Secretary*
1001 West Madison Street
Chicago, Ill.

Dear UNITY:

We who write this letter have lately come out of Leavenworth Penitentiary, after five years of incarceration for our ideas; and in 60 days we are to be deported because we have not retracted those ideas. During this brief leeway we want to do everything possible for those we left behind the bars; 53 workingmen are still serving from five to 20 years because they refused to support a war in which they did not believe. Nearly all of the 53 are members of the Industrial Workers of the World, in which we are proud to hold membership.

There is a large probability that all the war-opinion prisoners will shortly be turned loose. Unquestionably the Harding administration is sensitive to the pressure of public opinion which is being exerted from one country after another. Protests are being sounded by labor organizations and individuals in many lands, this being largely due to the tireless publicity work of the General Defense Committee in the last year.

Just before we left Leavenworth, all the other war-opinion prisoners were summoned one by one to the warden's office, and each was asked: "If your sentence is commuted by the President, will you agree to be law-abiding in the future?" That question, of course, implied that our fellow-workers had been law-breakers in the past; yet we contend, as do the others, that in expressing opinion against the war we were within our rights under the Constitution, which provides that "Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble. . . ."

Seven of those inside refused to answer the warden's question, we are told, while the others replied that they would obey the law in the future, but that they had always been law-abiding in the past. Warden Biddle declared that he was concerned only with the question of their future conduct, and cared not whether they were innocent or guilty of transgression in the past.

We have reason to believe that the government is on the point of washing its hands of a sticky problem by letting all the war-opinion prisoners out. In that way it could remove a source of annoying criticism, which must necessarily grow stronger until the last political has been liberated.

When our fellow-workers emerge into the sunshine and clean air again they will need practical aid. Most of them will come forth almost penniless, and needing clothes. And they will be up against the difficulty of getting a foothold in the productive world again; they will have to find jobs in a country where jobs are scarce, regardless of inspired reports of a labor shortage.

Some of the boys will come out in bad health, and will require immediate medical attention. Edward Quigley and Caesar Tabib have been gradually sinking through the stages of tuberculosis for many months, despite all appeals to President Harding to free them before they died. (Ricardo Flores Magon was permitted to die in his cell in the face of similar appeals). Harrison George has just been released after serving a five-year sentence, and is in bad physical condition. For months the penitentiary officials ignored his manifest need for the removal of his tonsils, and the resulting accumulation of poison in his system has undermined his health.

Out in New Mexico another fellow-worker, William Weyh, is fighting to regain a hold upon life. He was with us in Leavenworth until he was close to death. James Mulroney, who served his full term, is in a Chicago sanitarium. His health was broken while awaiting trial in the Sacramento jail (53 I. W. W. members were kept in a cell 21 by 21 feet for 64 terrible days and nights), and his strength was sapped still further in Leavenworth. His condition today is pathetic to contemplate.

And Frederick Esmond, another vic-

---

flict, more and more perceiving their mutual dependence, now rapidly learning the spirit of sympathy and co-operation, and already entering upon the era of Human Federation.

And Article XII says,

I believe that science is the consensus of the investigators—the latest and highest phase of man's development; and that its exercise in social relations will bring about "the union of all who love in the service of all who suffer."

At the end, in "glowing eloquence" is a "Retrospect and Prospect of Aryan Civilization" condensed into three pages! It is an airplane view of Aryan successes and failures from the Persian capture of Babylon to the World Domination by English-speaking Whites. The Scepter of World Power came into Anglo-Saxon hands when the "Invincible Armada" of darker romanic Spain went down.

"We Anglo-Saxons since have borne it round the world. No sun e'er sets beyond our sway." . . . "Opportunity is yet ours. Science can illume the way. The hopes of all races center in it. The world is an unlimited fount of progress. We cannot wish beyond its capacity to supply. Enlightened by the galaxy of Scientific achievements, our Aryan Race can lead on through indefinite ages with increasing triumph. Conferences of those who know and see and love will save it by substituting, always and everywhere, the newer modern for the older ancient."

These last sentences in the book hint the point, the spirit and the grasp.

On the last page the ominous word "IF—," in large type is printed with a dash after it. At first and at last the author emphasizes the startling belief that the people of the Northern Regions must realize that they have developed their own religion, grander than any that the world has ever known, that they must see the folly of the great Aryan or Nordic peoples blindly clinging to the borrowed folk-lore and legends of the dark white peoples of the Southern Regions.

In a pointed paragraph just before the preface, the writer says:

The White Race is facing its third crisis. The first was at the Fall of Rome. The second was at the Reformation. The third is now—at the rise of Science. It took a thousand years to recover from the first. The second was a remedy for that first. For a hundred years that remedy has been failing. Either a lapse or a boost in Civilization is due soon.

Professor Edward A. Ross, professor of sociology of the University of Wisconsin, has recently written:

As I look through Dr. Ward's important book again, I earnestly hope that it will not be smothered by orthodox hostilities, but will break its way through the barrage and really get read. It is sublimely learned and grandly earnest.

GEORGE GILMOUR.

THE WIND

A servant of the Lord, I wait,
Attentive to His will.
At His behest I range the plain,
The valley, and the hill.

I stir the ocean, in its sleep,
I churn the curdling foam,
And lift the billows from the deep,
And bear the wild bird home.

I pluck the old man by the beard,
I toy with maiden's hair,
I rock the young birds in their nests;
I drive away dull care.

I sing through forests old and dank;
And whisper in the ear
Of crouching marmots, in their sleep,
And start the tim'rous deer.

I make a music midst the leaves,
A music soft and low;
And fill the air with minstrelsy,
As when the Pipers blow.

—*John S. Vaughan.*

London Saturday Review.

tim of that Sacramento ordeal (in which five fellow-workers died before trial) is about to be released from St. Elizabeth's Hospital in Washington, D. C. He also must be sent to New Mexico so that he may have a chance for life.

You cannot understand what prison does to a human being until you have been confined in one. Unless a man's spirit is indomitable he breaks under the strain. Every day is a monotone, and the food is an everlasting repetition until the sight of it brings nausea. The air is unclean. It is reminiscent of the odors in a menagerie, except that the prison is worse.

To care for our fellow-workers who are coming out, the General Defense Committee must have money. Its treasury is very low, what with the constant demands from many quarters for defense of men prosecuted under state laws designed to suppress independent thought; for prison relief; and for the publicity that is so essential for all these cases.

In the name of our fellow-workers who still are caged; in the name of those who have given their all so that free speech may become a reality in the United States—we ask that you give all the money you can spare, and that you give quickly.

Yours for a square deal,
A. V. AZUARA,
SAM SCARLETT,
C. L. LAMBERT,
Sentenced to serve 20 years.
ARCHIE SINCLAIR,
Sentenced to serve 10 years.

UNITY HYMNS AND CHORALS

A BOOK OF HYMNS FOR HEART, HOME, CHURCH

335 Hymns and 115 Tunes, with Service Elements

The tunes are nearly all old and familiar. The hymns are hymns of self-consecration, thankfulness, trust, loving service to man, joyful faith in human progress and ever-lasting life, and warm communion between the child-soul and the indwelling Father-soul. (25 by Whittier, 34 by Frederick L. Hosmer)

A cut-leaf hymn-book—the device which brings every hymn beneath the tune to which it sings

Cloth-bound, 25 cents a copy, postpaid

An opportunity for small church groups to provide themselves with a hymn-book of rare quality at half-price

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, CHICAGO, ILL.

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.
PRINTERS and BINDERS
Telephone Wabash 3854 120-124 W. Polk St., CHICAGO

For Active Thinkers

BOWMAN'S MILK is rich in energy. It is a valuable aid to clear thinking.

It is easily assimilated. Does not overburden the digestive organs.

BOWMAN DAIRY Company

WRIGHT & COMPANY
STEAM—DOMESTIC
COAL
TELEPHONE WABASH 5028
Main Office:
28 E. Jackson Blvd.
CHICAGO

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES
Everything in HARDWARE
AT
PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

It's a "Case" of Necessity
Your Printing will be above criticism if done by
THE OAKLAND PRESS
728 E. 39th Street
Phone Douglas 244

DREXEL State Bank
Cottage Grove Ave. *and* Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor—large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Schumann & Company

Cleaners of
Fancy Gowns and Kid Gloves

Having winter garments cleaned before storing them will keep out moth

Phone Drexel 0231
All Departments

MAIN OFFICE AND WORK:
3954 Cottage Grove Avenue

Subscribe for UNITY! $3.00 the Year.